



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/595,288	06/15/2000	Erik P. Fiedorowicz	RSW9-2000-0041-US1	8794
7590 06/27/2006				
Jeanine S Ray-Yarletts IBM Corporation T81/062 Intellectual Property Law PO Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			EXAMINER HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/595,288	Applicant(s) FIEDOROWICZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-28 and 30-43 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) 9 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-13, 15-23, 25-28, 30-37, 40-43, 45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) 8, 24, 38 and 39 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 4/10/06 to the application filed 6/15/00.
2. Claims 1-13, 15-28, 30-43, 45 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 16 and 31 are independent claims.

Specification

3. Please update the serial number of the co-pending application on page 21, line 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 11-13, 16, 26-28, 31, 41-43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nielsen (US Pat No. 5,899,975, 5/4/99, filed 4/3/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Nielsen discloses:

- identifying a plurality of subset style sheets based on content of the electronic document (figure 7, #700-725: identifying the style sheets of the document), based on particular rendering characteristics of a client device to which the electronic document is to be sent (figure 7, col 7, lines 1-48: the fact that a check is made to determine if one or more local user stylesheets is present to retrieve for presenting the downloaded document shows that the stylesheets based on

the characteristics of the client device to which the electronic document is sent is identified), and based on a type of device of the client device (col 7, line 60 to col 8, line 15: the stylesheets for text and audio data are identified by the client system which includes display device for display text and audio subsystem for performing audio data)

- merging the plurality of subset style sheets to generate the composite style sheet (figure 7, #730, col 8, lines 1-15: the style sheets are combined in accordance with the rules)

Regarding independent claim 11, Nielsen discloses:

- - identifying a plurality of subset style sheets based on content of the electronic document (figure 7, #700-725: identifying the style sheets of the document)
- merging the plurality of subset style sheets to generate the composite style sheet (figure 7, #730, col 8, lines 1-15: the style sheets are combined in accordance with the rules)
- determining if a client device to which the electronic document is to be sent is capable of rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet, and sending the electronic document to the client device with a reference to the composite style sheet (figure 7, #700-725, figure 8, col 7, lines 1-15: the electronic document is downloaded or imported to a client device with a reference to an external stylesheet shows sending said document to a client device with a reference to an external style sheet)

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Nielsen discloses rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet and sending the rendered electronic document to the client device, if the client device is not capable of rendering the electronic document using the composite style sheet (figure 8, col 7, lines 1-15: the electronic document is downloaded or imported to a client device with a reference to an external stylesheet shows sending said document to a client device with a reference to an external style sheet which is retrieved from the network; this implies that the client device is not capable of rendering said style sheet).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Nielsen discloses that the rendered electronic document is one of an HTML document and a WML document (figure 8, col 7, lines 9-15).

Claims 26-28 are for an apparatus of method claims 11-13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 41-43 are for a computer program product of method claims 11-13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 16 is for an apparatus of method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 31 is for a computer program product of method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-7, 15, 17-23, 30, 32-37, 45 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen as applied to claims 1, 16 and 31 above, and further in view of Walsh, *The Extensible Style Language: {XSL} Styling XML Documents*, Web Techniques, Jan 1999, vol. 4, iss. 1, pg. 49, 5 pgs, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-10).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen does not disclose that the plurality of subset style sheets includes a global style sheet and other subset style sheets, and wherein merging the plurality of subset style sheets includes inserting the other style sheets into the global style sheet to generate the composite style sheet.

Walsh discloses that the plurality of subset style sheets includes a global style sheet and other subset style sheets, and wherein merging the plurality of subset style sheets includes inserting the other style sheets into the global style sheet to generate the composite style sheet (**page 3**: the fact the XSL processor starts at *the root node* until the last child node to process the style sheet templates implies the plurality of style

Art Unit: 2178

sheets includes a global style sheet, which is the style sheet at the root node of highest level, and other subset style sheets of the children nodes; **page 7**: copying each element in the template into the result tree until `xsl:process-children` is encountered shows inserting the other style sheets into the global style sheet of the document).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses inserting other style sheets into the global style sheet at the root node providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for easily combining the style sheets of the elements in a document.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen does not disclose inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet includes converting a root template in each of the other subset style sheets to a child template.

Walsh discloses that inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet includes converting a root template in each of the other subset style sheets to a child template (**page 7**: *"when `xsl:process-children` is encountered ... for each node, it finds the matching template and instantiates it. The sequence of instantiated templates is placed in the result tree at the location of the `xsl:process-children` element in the template; placing the sequence of said instantiated templates in the result tree inherently shows that the root template in the subset style*

Art Unit: 2178

sheets is converted to a child template since it was well known that a child node inherits the information from the root node, which is its ancestor).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses converting a root template in each of the other subset style sheets to a child template providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for easily merging the style sheets of the elements in a document using a template for the nodes in the structured document.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Nielsen does not disclose inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet further includes adjusting match phrases of embedded child templates and references in each of the other subset style sheets.

Walsh discloses inserting the other subset style sheets of the plurality of subset style sheets into the global style sheet further includes adjusting match phrases of embedded child templates and references in each of the other subset style sheets (**page 8**: "*The xsl: process instruction processes only selected children (or selected nodes from elsewhere in the tree). The xsl: process element has a required select attribute. All of the elements in the source tree that match the pattern specified in the select attribute are processed, and their instantiated templates are inserted into the result tree ...*").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses adjusting match phrases of embedded child templates and references in each of the other subset style

sheets providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for having an effective way to insert the subset style sheets into the global style sheet.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen does not disclose that the other subset style sheets are inserted following a root template of the global style sheet. Walsh discloses that the other subset style sheets are inserted following a root template of the global style sheet (**page 7**: *“when `xsl:process-children` is encountered ... for each node, it finds the matching template and instantiates it. The sequence of instantiated templates is placed in the result tree at the location of the `xsl:process-children` element in the template;* placing the sequence of said instantiated templates in the result tree inherently shows inserting the subset style sheets following a root template of the global style sheet; **page 8**: “The `xsl: process` instruction processes only selected children (or selected nodes from elsewhere in the tree). The `xsl: process` element has a required `select` attribute. All of the elements in the source tree that match the pattern specified in the `select` attribute are processed, and their instantiated templates are inserted into the result tree ...”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses inserting the subset style sheets following a root template of the global style sheet providing the advantage to incorporate into Nielsen for using the template technique for inserting the subset style sheets.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Nielsen discloses identifying a plurality of subset style sheets as mentioned in claim 1, but does not disclose that said identifying includes parsing the electronic document into a document object model and examining first level child elements of the document object model.

Walsh discloses that identifying a plurality of subset style sheets includes parsing the electronic document into a document object model and examining first level child elements of the document object model (**page 2**, last two sentences to **page 3, second paragraph**: the source tree, which is the *tree representation of the parsed XML source document* where each node of the document has a style sheet implies that said style sheets are identified by parsing the electronic document).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen for easily identifying the style sheets of the elements in a document by examining the document object model generated from parsing the document.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Nielsen does not disclose matching values of the first level child elements to characteristic identifier of subset style sheets in a subset style sheet repository and selecting the plurality of subset style sheets from the subset style sheets in the subset style sheet repository based on whether the first child element values match characteristic identifiers for the subset style sheets

Walsh discloses matching values of the first level child elements to characteristic identifier of subset style sheets in a subset style sheet repository and selecting the

Art Unit: 2178

plurality of subset style sheets from the subset style sheets in the subset style sheet repository based on whether the first child element values match characteristic identifiers for the subset style sheets (**page 8, page 3**: the fact the XSL processor starts at *the root node* until the last child node to process the style sheet templates implies the plurality of style sheets includes a global style sheet, which is the style sheet at the root node, and the other subset style sheets of the children nodes; also, the fact that all of the elements in the source tree that match the pattern specified in the selected attribute are processed, and their instantiated templates are inserted into the result tree shows said matching values).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen since Walsh discloses the matching values of the child elements that match characteristics for the style sheets of the elements thus motivating to incorporate into Nielsen for obtaining a tool to easily identify the subset style sheet to be merged.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen does not disclose the global style sheet includes a prefix glue that generates cards from the merged subset style sheet.

Walsh discloses that the global style sheet includes a prefix glue that generates cards from the merged subset style sheet (page 3, What Does XSL Look Like?).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Walsh into Nielsen for effectively generating data from the merged subset style sheet.

Claims 17-23, 30 are for an apparatus of method claims 2-7, 15 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 32-37, 45 are for a computer program product of method claims 2-7, 15 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 10, 25, 40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Walsh as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Feibus, Visual InterDev Improves, InformationWeek, September 28, 1998, Iss. 702, pg. 18A, 2 pgs, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-3.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2, Nielsen and Walsh do not disclose that the global style sheet includes electronic document navigational information.

Feibus discloses that technology from FrontPage 98 allows users to organize the Web documents in their site and automatically update the navigation-bar buttons that you can include as part of each document's style sheet (page 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Feibus into Nielsen and Walsh since Feibus

shows that the navigation-bar button data can be included in each document's style sheet providing the advantage to incorporate into Walsh to generate a document with interaction feature by including the navigational data in the document's style sheet.

Claims 25 and 40 are for an apparatus and a computer program product of method claim 10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 8, 24, 38, 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
10. Claim 9 is allowed.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2178

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lecton et al. (US Pat No. 6,446,110, filed 4/5/99).

Stark et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2003/00233420, priority 4/3/00).

Goto et al. (US Pat App Pub No 2001/0011287).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (9:00-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
06/19/06